

REMARKS

Status Summary

In this amendment, no claims are added and no claims are canceled. Therefore, claims 1-50 remain pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2006/0212385 to Bent et al., (hereinafter, "Bent") and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0023529 to Jacobsen, (hereinafter, "Jacobsen") in view of "U.S. Patent No. 7,328,179 to Sheehan et al., (hereinafter, "Sheehan"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 1, 14, and 27 recite a method, a computer program product, and a system for facilitating financial transactions between commercial banks and depositor groups. Each of the claims recites that deposit needs of plural different depositor groups are aggregated to form a stable funds source usable by different commercial banks as core deposits. Each of the claims has been amended to recite that the depositor groups are different depositor groups and that the deposit needs of the depositor groups include an amount of funds available for deposit from each depositor group as demand deposits. Support for this amendment is found, for example, on page 16, lines 7-10 of the present specification. Thus, each of the independent claims recites that funds available for deposit as demand deposits from different depositor groups are aggregated to provide a stable funds source that a

commercial bank can consider as core deposits once the funds are deposited with each commercial bank.

As stated in Applicants' response to the previous office action and as stated in the present office action, Bent and Jacobsen fail to disclose, teach, or suggest aggregating deposit needs of different deposit groups to provide a stable funds source usable by different commercial banks as core deposits. Bent and Jacobsen are directed to distributing individual investors' deposits among different institutions to achieve full F.D.I.C. insurance and neither mentions the aggregation of deposits including amounts of funds available from each depositor group as demand deposits.

Sheehan likewise lacks such disclosure, teaching, or suggestion. In contrast to being directed to aggregating amounts of funds available for deposit from a plurality of different depositor groups, Sheehan is directed to methods for calculating retention rates for core deposits currently deposited with a particular financial institution so that the institution can determine how to value or use those deposits.

For example, Sheehan states:

Generally, the longer the maturity of an asset the higher the interest rate paid on it. This creates a performance incentive for financial institution managers to buy longer maturity assets. Funding longer maturity assets with retail deposits presents special challenges, though. This is because balances in some types of deposits-so called "core deposits" (a/k/a non-maturity deposits) including categories such as NOW (Negotiable Order of Withdrawal), savings, checking and MMDA (money market demand accounts), are eligible to be withdrawn from the institution actually or virtually upon demand. If such deposits are used to buy longer maturity assets, a potentially serious asset and liability maturity mis-match is apparently created.

In fact, however, a substantial fraction of core deposits tend to stay in an institution for a period measured in years rather than in days or weeks. Thus, financial institutions can and do in a probabilistic sense use these deposits to fund purchases of long-term assets. However, such purchases are fraught with uncertainty given the unknown true maturity of the underlying deposits. (See column 1, lines 21-42 of Sheehan.)

In the above quoted passage, Sheehan indicates that there is a risk to a financial institution in using core deposits, which have no maturity, to purchase assets with longer term maturity, because a particular financial institution does not know how long the core deposits will remain in the institution. In order to solve this potential issue, Sheehan discloses statistical methods for estimating how long core deposits might remain in a particular institution (i.e., the retention time) and the sensitivity of core deposits to economic factors, such as interest rate spreads. There is no mention of aggregating funds available for deposit from different depositor groups as demand deposits so that a given bank can obtain core deposits. Rather, Sheehan is directed to a method that helps commercial banks determine how they can use core deposits that they already have.

Accordingly, for these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of the claims as unpatentable over Bent and Jacobsen in view of Sheehan should be withdrawn.

Serial No.: 10/645,778

CONCLUSION

In light of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early notice to such effect is earnestly solicited.

If any small matter should remain outstanding after the Patent Examiner has had an opportunity to review the above Remarks, the Patent Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned patent attorney in order to resolve these matters and avoid the issuance of another Official Action.

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT


The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with the filing of this correspondence to Deposit Account No. 50-0426.

Respectfully submitted,

JENKINS, WILSON, TAYLOR & HUNT, P.A.

Date: January 19, 2010

By: _____



Gregory A. Hunt
Registration No. 41,085
Customer No. 25297

1483/3

GAH/trb/sda